REMARKS

1. Present Status of Patent Application

In response to the final Office Action dated April 17, 2009, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the following remarks. In the present response, claims 29, 36, 37, 39, and 49 have been amended. Claims 29 and 36-58 remain pending in the present application. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

2. Response to Claim Objections

Claims 36-37 have been objected to because of informalities. To address the Examiner's concerns, the claims have been amended. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

3. Response to Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 39-42, 48-52, and 58 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Dinkin* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0050150) in view of *Goldman* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0233418) in further view of *Horvitz* (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,130) in further view of Official Notice. Claims 29, 38, 43-45, and 53-55 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Dinkin* in view of *Goldman* in view of *Gordon* (U.S. Patent No. 6,732,157) in further view of *Horvitz* in further view of Official Notice. Claims 36, 37, 46, 47, 56, and 57 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Dinkin* in view of *Goldman* in view of *Gordon* in further view of *Horvitz* (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,130) in further view of Official Notice in further view of *Gross* (U.S. Patent No. 6,782,510).

a. Claim 29

As provided in independent claim 29, Applicant claims:

> An email filtering system comprising:
>
> an electronic messaging computer for viewing electronic messages addressed to a user, the electronic messaging computer having a single graphical user interface control to provide, to the user, options for configuring each of a plurality of detection mechanisms that detect undesired electronic messages from incoming electronic messages retrieved for the user, the single graphical user interface control enabling the user to activate and deactivate each of the plurality of detection mechanisms independently of one another in order to provide a desired level of protection from undesired electronic messages, wherein the plurality of detection mechanisms comprise at least three different detection mechanisms used to detect undesired electronic messages, wherein the plurality of detection mechanisms include:
>
> a first detection mechanism that detects an email message if the sender of the email message is not on a list of senders authorized by the user;
>
> a second detection mechanism that detects an email message if the sender of the email is on a list of unauthorized senders;
>
> a third detection mechanism that detects an email message if the email message contains a textual content string that is on a list of unauthorized textual content strings; and
>
> a fourth detection mechanism that is configured to:
>
> analyze the overall content of previous email messages that have been detected;
>
> compare the content of an email message to the overall content and assign a score reflective of a level of similarity for the email message; and
>
> detect the email message if the score is higher than a designated score,
>
> ***wherein the electronic messaging computer is configured to:***
>
> ***automatically designate an email message as an undesired email message after the email message is detected by one of the plurality of detection mechanisms;***
>
> ***display a preview of contents of a message body of an email message, wherein the display of a preview of contents of a message body is disabled for an email message that has been marked as being undesired;***
>
> ***enable the user to reclassify an email message by changing a prior designation of the email message from an undesired email message to a desired email message classification; and***
>
> ***in response to changing the designation of the email message, prompt the user to modify settings of the particular detection***

> ***mechanism that caused the email message to be designated as an undesired email message so that the email message is not to be detected by the particular detection mechanism after the settings are changed,***
> ***wherein the single graphical interface comprises:***
> ***a first interface mechanism to activate the first detection mechanism;***
> ***a second interface mechanism to activate an interface to edit the list of senders authorized by the user;***
> ***a third interface mechanism to activate the second detection mechanism;***
> ***a fourth interface mechanism to activate an interface to edit the list of senders not authorized by the user;***
> ***a fifth interface mechanism to activate the third detection mechanism;***
> ***a sixth interface mechanism to activate an interface to edit the list of unauthorized textual content strings;***
> ***a seventh interface mechanism to activate the fourth detection mechanism, and***
> ***an eighth interface mechanism to adjust the designated score.***

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 29 is allowable for at least the reason that *Dinkin* in view of *Goldman* in further view of *Gordon* in further view of *Horvitz* in further view of Official Notice does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "wherein the electronic messaging computer is configured to: automatically designate an email message as an undesired email message after the email message is detected by one of the plurality of detection mechanisms; display a preview of contents of a message body of an email message, wherein the display of a preview of contents of a message body is disabled for an email message that has been marked as being undesired; enable the user to reclassify an email message by changing a prior designation of the email message from an undesired email message to a desired email message classification; and in response to changing the designation of the email message, prompt the user to modify settings of the particular detection mechanism that caused the email message to be designated as an undesired email message so that the email message is not to be detected by the particular detection mechanism after the settings are changed, wherein the single graphical interface comprises: a first interface mechanism to activate the first detection mechanism; a second interface mechanism to activate an interface to edit the list of senders authorized by the user; a third interface mechanism to activate the second detection mechanism; a fourth interface mechanism to activate an interface to edit the list of senders not authorized by the user; a fifth interface mechanism to activate the third detection mechanism; a sixth interface mechanism to activate an interface to edit the list of unauthorized textual content strings; a seventh interface mechanism to activate the fourth detection mechanism, and

an eighth interface mechanism to adjust the designated score," as emphasized above.

For example, *Dinkin* describes a filter for filtering electronic mail messages and does not address changing a designation of an undesired email message by a user or the causing of prompts to adjust settings associated with a detection mechanism. To illustrate, paragraph 0095 of *Dinkin* describes that patterns in an image from an email message may be used to categorize the email message as legitimate or not legitimate; paragraphs 0097-0098 of *Dinkin* disclose that a filter used to filter email messages may be trained to improve performance of the filter; paragraph 0121 of *Dinkin* describes that a filter characteristic may be adjusted; paragraph 0111 of *Dinkin* describes that a sender of a rejected email message may be automatically added to a blacklist of senders. Therefore, as illustrated above, *Dinkin* fails to teach or suggest all of the claimed features, such as "in response to changing the designation of the email message, prompt the user to modify settings of the particular detection mechanism that caused the email message to be designated as an undesired email message so that the email message is not to be detected by the particular detection mechanism after the settings are changed," as recited in claim 29.

Additionally, Applicant submit that *Dinkin* teaches or suggests "wherein the single graphical interface comprises: a first interface mechanism to activate the first detection mechanism; a second interface mechanism to activate an interface to edit the list of senders authorized by the user; a third interface mechanism to activate the second detection mechanism; a fourth interface mechanism to activate an interface to edit the list of senders not authorized by the user; a fifth interface mechanism to activate the third detection mechanism; a sixth interface mechanism to activate an interface to edit the list of unauthorized textual content strings; a seventh interface mechanism to activate the fourth detection mechanism, and an eighth interface mechanism to adjust the designated score," as recited in claim 29.

Further, *Goldman* describes removal of mail from an unauthorized sender, where a sender's address is categorized as authorized, unauthorized, or unconfirmed. Accordingly, *Goldman* does not address changing a designation of an undesired email message by a user or the causing of prompts to adjust settings associated with a detection mechanism.

In addition, *Gordon* describes that a "system, method and computer program product are provided for filtering unwanted electronic mail messages. After receiving electronic mail messages, the electronic mail messages that are unwanted are filtered utilizing a combination of techniques including: compound filters, paragraph hashing, and Bayes rules. The electronic mail messages that are filtered as being unwanted are then categorized." *See* Abstract. Accordingly, *Gordon* does not address changing a designation of an undesired email message by a user or the causing of prompts to adjust settings associated with a detection mechanism.

Further, *Horvitz* describes a training set being utilized by an e-mail program to update a classifier module used to classify incoming mail messages. *See* col. 10, lines 27-38. Accordingly, *Horvitz* does not address changing a designation of an undesired email message by a user or the causing of prompts being provided to a user to adjust settings associated with a detection mechanism.

However, the Final Office Action issued April 17, 2009 contends that *Horvitz* discloses the disabling of a display of a preview of an email message for spam messages. The passage of *Horvitz* referenced in the Office Action states that "the contents of spam folder 227 are displayed upon a specific request from the user" while "the contents of legitimate mail folder 223 are generally displayed automatically." Col. 9, lines 6-9. Therefore, Applicant submits that *Horvitz* describes that a list of items (*e.g.*, message headings) contained in a folder may or may not be automatically shown and that *Horvitz* fails to disclose "wherein the display of a **preview of contents of a message body** is disabled for an email message that has been marked as being undesired," as recited in claim 29. If this was the case in *Horvitz*, then Applicant submits that the contents of 50 messages would be automatically previewed for a legitimate fail folder holding 50 messages, as an example. However, *Horvitz* does not disclose that the content of a message body an email message is previewed in this manner. *Horvitz* simply discloses that the contents of a mail folder are displayed. As a result, *Horvitz* does not disclose the claimed matter described above.

Further, the Final Office Action contends that it is well known to prompt a user in response to a detected event and takes Official Notice of this alleged fact. *See* page 3. In response, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed subject matter describes the providing of prompts to a user in response to changing the designation of the email message, whereby the user is prompted to modify settings of the particular detection mechanism that caused the email message to be designated as an undesired email message so that the email message is not to be detected by the particular detection mechanism after the settings are changed. The foregoing has not been demonstrated to be well-known and therefore, Applicant respectfully traverses the finding of Official Notice. Applicant stands by the reasoning presented in the previous responses for traversal of the Official Notice. Accordingly, the alleged facts should not be deemed admitted by the Applicant.

It is noted that *Lemke* (U.S. Patent No. 6,748,403) has been provided in the Final Office Action to support the finding of Official Notice, where *Lemke* is stated by the Examiner to disclose prompting a user to change settings in detection of an event." Page 3. After reviewing *Lemke*, it appears to disclose prompting a user to either delete or modify a contact on a handheld computer 100 during synchronization of the handheld computer 100 with another computer 102. *See* col. 10, lines 11-14. Accordingly, *Lemke* fails to demonstrate as being well known the following: providing of prompts to a user in response to changing the designation of the email message, whereby the user is prompted to modify settings of the particular detection mechanism that caused the email message to be designated as an undesired email message so that the email message is not to be detected by the particular detection mechanism after the settings are changed. Therefore, Applicant respectfully traverses the finding of Official Notice as utilized in this rejection (and the other rejections where applicable).

Additionally, the Final Office Action asserts that the phrase after "so that" in the claim "is merely an intended use of the prompting, and is therefore not given weight."

Page 3. In response, Applicant respectfully submits that a reading of the claim reveals that the phrase after "so that" is describing the type of settings that can be modified for a particular detection mechanism "so that the email message is not to be detected by the particular detection mechanism after the settings are changed." Therefore, this language clearly does not refer to an "intended use" and is entitled to patentable weight.

Accordingly, *Dinkin* in view of *Goldman* in further view of *Gordon* in further view of *Horvitz* in further view of Official Notice fails to teach or suggest at least "wherein the electronic messaging computer is configured to: automatically designate an email message as an undesired email message after the email message is detected by one of the plurality of detection mechanisms; display a preview of contents of a message body of an email message, wherein the display of a preview of contents of a message body is disabled for an email message that has been marked as being undesired; enable the user to reclassify an email message by changing a prior designation of the email message from an undesired email message to a desired email message classification; and in response to changing the designation of the email message, prompt the user to modify settings of the particular detection mechanism that caused the email message to be designated as an undesired email message so that the email message is not to be detected by the particular detection mechanism after the settings are changed, wherein the single graphical interface comprises: a first interface mechanism to activate the first detection mechanism; a second interface mechanism to activate an interface to edit the list of senders authorized by the user; a third interface mechanism to activate the second detection mechanism; a fourth interface mechanism to activate an interface to edit the list of senders not authorized by the user; a fifth interface mechanism to activate the third detection mechanism; a sixth interface mechanism to activate an interface to edit the list of unauthorized textual content strings; a seventh interface mechanism to activate the fourth detection mechanism, and an eighth interface mechanism to adjust the designated score," as recited in claim 29.

For at least these reasons, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established, and claim 29 is patentable over the proposed combination of *Dinkin* in view of *Goldman* in further view of *Gordon* in further view of *Horvitz* in further view of Official Notice. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 29 is respectfully requested.

b. Claims 36-38

Claim 29 is allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons given above. Since claim 38 depends from and includes the features of claim 29 and recite additional features, claim 38 is allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

Further, *Gross* is legally inadequate to remedy the deficiencies of *Dinkin*, *Goldman*, *Gordon*, and *Horvitz* with respect to independent claim 29. Since claims 36-37 depend from and include the features of claim 29 and recite additional features, claims 36-37 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

c. Claim 39

As provided in independent claim 39, Applicant claims:

> A method for providing electronic messaging, comprising:
>
> providing a plurality of detection approaches for detecting undesired email messages;
>
> providing access to each of the detection approaches from a single graphical interface control, the single graphical user interface control enabling the user to activate and deactivate each of the plurality of detection mechanisms independently of one another in order to provide a desired level of protection from undesired electronic messages, wherein the plurality of detection mechanisms comprise at least three different detection mechanisms used to detect undesired electronic messages;
>
> ***automatically designating an email message as an undesired email message after the email message is detected by one of the plurality of detection mechanisms;***
>
> ***displaying a preview of contents of a message body of an email message, wherein the display of a preview of contents of a message body is disabled for an email message that has been marked as being undesired;***
>
> ***enabling the user to reclassify an email message by changing a prior designation of the email message from an undesired email message to a desired email message classification; and***
>
> ***in response to changing the designation of the email message, prompting the user to modify settings of the particular detection mechanism that caused the email message to be designated as an undesired email message so that the email message is not to be detected by the particular detection mechanism after the settings are changed***.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 39 is allowable for at least the reason that *Dinkin* in view of *Goldman* in further view of *Horvitz* in further view of Official Notice does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "automatically designating an email message as an undesired email message after the email message is detected by one of the plurality of detection mechanisms; displaying a preview of contents of a message body of an email message, wherein the display of a preview of contents of a message body is disabled for an email message that has been marked as being undesired; enabling the user to reclassify an email message by changing a prior designation of the email message from an undesired email message to a desired email message classification; and in response to changing the designation of the email message, prompting the user to modify settings of the particular detection mechanism that caused the email message to be designated as an undesired email message so that the email message is not to be detected by the particular detection mechanism after the settings are changed," as emphasized above.

For example, *Dinkin* describes a filter for filtering electronic mail messages and does not address changing a designation of an undesired email message by a user or the causing of prompts to adjust settings associated with a detection mechanism. To illustrate, paragraph 0095 of *Dinkin* describes that patterns in an image from an email message may be used to categorize the email message as legitimate or not legitimate; paragraphs 0097-0098 of *Dinkin* disclose that a filter used to filter email messages may be trained to improve performance of the filter; paragraph 0121 of *Dinkin* describes that a filter characteristic may be adjusted; paragraph 0111 of *Dinkin* describes that a sender of a rejected email message may be automatically added to a blacklist of senders. Therefore, as illustrated above, *Dinkin* fails to teach or suggest all of the claimed features, such as "automatically designating an email message as an undesired email message after the email message is detected by one of the plurality of detection mechanisms; displaying a preview of contents of a message body of an email message, wherein the display of a preview of contents of a message body is disabled for an email message that has been marked as being undesired; enabling the user to reclassify an email message by changing a prior designation of the email message from an undesired email message to a desired email message classification; and in response to changing the designation of the email message, prompting the user to modify settings of the particular detection mechanism that caused the email message to be designated as an undesired email message so that the email message is not to be detected by the particular detection mechanism after the settings are changed," as recited in claim 39.

Further, *Goldman* describes removal of mail from an unauthorized sender, where a sender's address is categorized as authorized, unauthorized, or unconfirmed. Accordingly, *Goldman* does not address changing a designation of an undesired email message by a user or the causing of prompts to adjust settings associated with a detection mechanism.

Further, *Horvitz* describes a training set being utilized by an e-mail program to update a classifier module used to classify incoming mail messages. *See* col. 10, lines 27-38. Accordingly, *Horvitz* does not address changing a designation of an undesired email message by a user or the causing of prompts being provided to a user to adjust settings associated with a detection mechanism.

However, the Final Office Action issued April 17, 2009 contends that *Horvitz* discloses the disabling of a display of a preview of an email message for spam messages. The passage of *Horvitz* referenced in the Final Office Action states that "the contents of spam folder 227 are displayed upon a specific request from the user" while "the contents of legitimate mail folder 223 are generally displayed automatically." Col. 9, lines 6-9. Therefore, Applicant submits that *Horvitz* describes that a list of items (*e.g.*, message headings) contained in a folder may or may not be automatically shown and that *Horvitz* fails to disclose "displaying a preview of contents of a message body of an email message, wherein the display of a preview of contents of a message body is disabled for an email message that has been marked as being undesired," as recited in claim 39. If this was the case in *Horvitz*, then Applicant submits that the contents of 50 messages would be automatically previewed for a legitimate fail folder holding 50 messages, as an example. However, *Horvitz* does not disclose that the content of a message body of an email message is previewed in this manner. *Horvitz* simply discloses that the contents of a mail folder are displayed. As a result, *Horvitz* does not disclose the claimed matter described above.

Further, the Final Office Action contends that it is well known to prompt a user in response to a detected event and takes Official Notice of this alleged fact. *See* page 3. In response, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed subject matter describes prompting a user to modify settings of the particular detection mechanism that caused the email message to be designated as an undesired email message so that the email message is not to be detected by the particular detection mechanism after the settings are changed. The foregoing has not been demonstrated to be well-known and therefore, Applicant respectfully traverses the finding of Official Notice. Applicant stands by the reasoning presented in the previous response for traversal of the Official Notice. Accordingly, the alleged facts should not be deemed admitted by the Applicant.

Further, the Final Office Action asserts that the phrase after "so that" in the claim "is merely an intended use of the prompting, and is therefore not given weight." Page 3. In response, Applicant respectfully submits that a reading of the claim reveals that the phrase after "so that" is describing the type of settings that can be modified for a particular detection mechanism "so that the email message is not to be detected by the particular detection mechanism after the settings are changed." Therefore, this language clearly does not refer to an "intended use" and is entitled to patentable weight.

For at least these reasons, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established, and claim 39 is patentable over the proposed combination of *Dinkin* in view of *Goldman* in further view of *Horvitz* in further view of Official Notice. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 39 is respectfully requested.

d. Claims 40-48

Claim 39 is allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons given above. Since claims 40-42 and 48 depend from and include the features of claim 39 and recite additional features, claims 40-42 and 48 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

Additionally, *Gordon* is legally inadequate to remedy the deficiencies of *Dinkin*, *Goldman*, and *Horvitz* with respect to independent claim 39. Since claims 43-45 depend from and include the features of claim 39 and recite additional features, claims 43-45 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

Further, *Gross* is legally inadequate to remedy the deficiencies of *Dinkin*, *Goldman*, *Gordon*, and *Horvitz* with respect to independent claim 39. Since claims 46-47 depend from and include the features of claim 39 and recite additional features, claims 46-47 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

e. Claim 49

As provided in independent claim 49, Applicant claims:

> A computer readable storage medium having stored thereon computer program codes that when executed by a computer cause the computer to perform:
>
> providing a plurality of detection approaches for detecting undesired email messages;
>
> providing access to each of the detection approaches from a single graphical interface control, the single graphical user interface control enabling the user to activate and deactivate each of the plurality of detection mechanisms independently of one another in order to provide a desired level of protection from undesired electronic messages, wherein the plurality of detection mechanisms comprise at least three different detection mechanisms used to detect undesired electronic messages;
>
> ***automatically designating an email message as an undesired email message after the email message is detected by one of the plurality of detection mechanisms;***
>
> ***displaying a preview of contents of a message body of an email message, wherein the display of a preview of contents of a message body is disabled for an email message that has been marked as being undesired;***
>
> ***enabling the user to reclassify an email message by changing a prior designation of the email message from an undesired email message to a desired email message classification; and***
>
> ***in response to changing the designation of the email message, prompting the user to modify settings of the particular detection mechanism that caused the email message to be designated as an undesired email message so that the email message is not to be detected by the particular detection mechanism after the settings are changed.***

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 49 is allowable for at least the reason that *Dinkin* in view of *Goldman* in view of *Horvitz* in further view of Official Notice does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "automatically designating an email message as an undesired email message after the email message is detected by one of the plurality of detection mechanisms; displaying a preview of contents of a message body of an email message, wherein the display of a preview of contents of a message body is disabled for an email message that has been marked as being undesired; enabling the user to reclassify an email message by changing a prior designation of the email message from an undesired email message to a desired email message classification; and in response to changing the designation of the email message, prompting the user to modify settings of the particular detection mechanism that caused the email message to be designated as an undesired email message so that the email message is not to be detected by the particular detection mechanism after the settings are changed," as emphasized above.

For example, *Dinkin* describes a filter for filtering electronic mail messages and does not address changing a designation of an undesired email message by a user or the causing of prompts to adjust settings associated with a detection mechanism. To illustrate, paragraph 0095 of *Dinkin* describes that patterns in an image from an email message may be used to categorize the email message as legitimate or not legitimate; paragraphs 0097-0098 of *Dinkin* disclose that a filter used to filter email messages may be trained to improve performance of the filter; paragraph 0121 of *Dinkin* describes that a filter characteristic may be adjusted; paragraph 0111 of *Dinkin* describes that a sender of a rejected email message may be automatically added to a blacklist of senders. Therefore, as illustrated above, *Dinkin* fails to teach or suggest all of the claimed features, such as "automatically designating an email message as an undesired email message after the email message is detected by one of the plurality of detection mechanisms; displaying a preview of contents of a message body of an email message, wherein the display of a preview of contents of a message body is disabled for an email message that has been marked as being undesired; enabling the user to reclassify an email message by changing a prior designation of the email message from an undesired email message to a desired email message classification; and in response to changing the designation of the email message, prompting the user to modify settings of the particular detection mechanism that caused the email message to be designated as an undesired email message so that the email message is not to be detected by the particular detection mechanism after the settings are changed," as recited in claim 49.

Further, *Goldman* describes removal of mail from an unauthorized sender, where a sender's address is categorized as authorized, unauthorized, or unconfirmed. Accordingly, *Goldman* does not address changing a designation of an undesired email message by a user or the causing of prompts to adjust settings associated with a detection mechanism.

Further, *Horvitz* describes a training set being utilized by an e-mail program to update a classifier module used to classify incoming mail messages. *See* col. 10, lines 27-38. Accordingly, *Horvitz* does not address changing a designation of an undesired email message by a user or the causing of prompts being provided to a user to adjust settings associated with a detection mechanism.

However, the Final Office Action issued April 17, 2009 contends that *Horvitz* discloses the disabling of a display of a preview of an email message for spam messages. The passage of *Horvitz* referenced in the Final Office Action states that "the contents of spam folder 227 are displayed upon a specific request from the user" while "the contents of legitimate mail folder 223 are generally displayed automatically." Col. 9, lines 6-9. Therefore, Applicant submits that *Horvitz* describes that a list of items (*e.g.*, message headings) contained in a folder may or may not be automatically shown and that *Horvitz* fails to disclose "displaying a preview of contents of an email message, wherein the display of a preview is disabled for an email message that has been marked as being undesired," as recited in claim 49. If this was the case in *Horvitz*, then Applicant submits that the contents of 50 messages would be automatically previewed for a legitimate fail folder holding 50 messages, as an example. However, *Horvitz* does not disclose that the content of a message body of an email message is previewed in this manner. *Horvitz* simply discloses that the contents of a mail folder are displayed. As a result, *Horvitz* does not disclose the claimed matter described above.

Further, the Final Office Action contends that it is well known to prompt a user in response to a detected event and takes Official Notice of this alleged fact. *See* page 3. In response, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed subject matter describes prompting a user to modify settings of the particular detection mechanism that caused the email message to be designated as an undesired email message so that the email message is not to be detected by the particular detection mechanism after the settings are changed. The foregoing has not been demonstrated to be well-known and therefore, Applicant respectfully traverses the finding of Official Notice. Applicant stands by the reasoning presented in the previous response for traversal of the Official Notice. Accordingly, the alleged facts should not be deemed admitted by the Applicant.

Further, the Final Office Action asserts that the phrase after “so that” in the claim “is merely an intended use of the prompting, and is therefore not given weight.” Page 3. In response, Applicant respectfully submits that a reading of the claim reveals that the phrase after “so that” is describing the type of settings that can be modified for a particular detection mechanism “so that the email message is not to be detected by the particular detection mechanism after the settings are changed.” Therefore, this language clearly does not refer to an “intended use” and is entitled to patentable weight.

As a result, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established, and claim 49 is patentable over the proposed combination of *Dinkin* in view of *Goldman* in further view of *Horvitz* in further view of Official Notice. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 49 is respectfully requested.

f. Claims 50-58

Claim 49 is allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons given above. Since claims 50-52 and 58 depend from and include the features of claim 49 and recite additional features, claims 50-52 and 58 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

Further, *Gordon* is legally inadequate to remedy the deficiencies of *Dinkin*, *Goldman*, and *Horvitz* with respect to independent claim 49. Since claims 53-55 depend from and include the features of claim 49 and recite additional features, claims 53-55 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

In addition, *Gross* is legally inadequate to remedy the deficiencies of *Dinkin*, *Goldman*, *Gross*, and *Horvitz* with respect to independent claim 49. Since claims 56-57 depend from and include the features of claim 49 and recite additional features, claims 56-57 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

CONCLUSION

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known for at least the specific and particular reason that the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

/Charles W. Griggers/
Charles W. Griggers, Reg. No. 47,283

AT&T Legal Department – TKHR
Attn: Patent Docketing
One AT&T Way
Room 2A-207
Bedminster, NJ 07921
Customer No.: **38823**